APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,667	09/02/2003	Sung-Dae Lee	678-1022	4624

66547   7590   01/28/2008
THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD
SUITE 701
UNIONDALE, NY 11553

EXAMINER
VU, KIEU D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *16 and 17* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-12 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7-8 and 13-15* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 11/13/07.

2.   Claims 1-17 and 29 have been elected for examination. Claims 18-28 are

withdrawn.

3.   The Declaration filed on 11/13/07 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but

is ineffective to overcome the Bitzer reference because of the following reasons:

        a. The Declaration was signed by Mr. Seok-Kyoun PARK who is not the inventor

of the application. Mr. PARK simply states that he has diligently attempted to contact

the inventor without success but fails to provide proofs of pertinent facts to prove his

unsuccessful attempt. Accordingly, the Declaration is ineffective to overcome the Bitzer

reference. See MPEP 715.04, 37 CFR 1.47, and 37 CFR 1.183.

        b. Since the inventor is now unavailable to sign the Declaration under 37

CFR 1.131, petition under 37 CFR 1.183 requesting waiver of the signature of the

unavailable inventor must be submitted with the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. In the

instant application, the Declaration filed 11/13/07 under 37 CFR 1.131 was not

submitted with petition under 37 CFR 1.183. Accordingly, the Declaration is ineffective

to overcome the Bitzer reference. See MPEP 715.04, 37 CFR 1.47, and 37 CFR 1.183.

        As a result, Examiner respectfully maintains that Bitzer reference is a qualified

prior art of the rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bitzer (US 2006/0167677).

Regarding claims 1 and 29, Bitzer teaches a communication system for

supporting multiple languages for a mobile communication terminal, the system

comprising: a mobile communication network (Fig. 5 shows a network in which data

language package can be downloaded to the mobile communication terminal) ([0032]) ;

a multiple language contents provider server (MLCPS) connected to the mobile

communication network and including multiple language contents ([0053]); and a

mobile communication terminal wirelessly connected to the mobile communication

network; wherein the mobile communication terminal connects to the MLCPS

through the mobile communication network, transmits language package request

data to the MLCPS according to a request of a user (user's requesting the download of

a language package, receives language package information provided from the

MLCPS (reception of the language package) ([0054]), and storing the received

language package information ([0050]), and displays menus and messages on a

display window of the mobile communication terminal in a language selected by the

user using the received language package information (Fig. 3); and wherein the

MLCPS forms a corresponding language package in response to reception of the

language package request data and transmits the language package to the mobile

communication terminal through the mobile communication network (Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bitzer and Dunko et al (US 2002/0072347).

Regarding claim 2, Bitzer does not teach that the language package request data

comprises a terminal model name, a software version, a string set version, and a font

set version. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Dunko. Dunko

teaches a mobile device which is capable of sending a request to a server, the request

comprises language, model, software... (Fig. 4) ([0026]). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Bitzer and Dunko before him at the

time the invention was made, to include Dunko's teaching in Bitzer's language package

to ensure that the received language package is compatible with the mobile terminal.

Regarding claim 3, Bitzer in view of Dunko teaches wherein the language

package request data further comprises font types and character codes that are

supported by the mobile communication terminal (Bitzer, Fig. 3-4) (Dunko, [0026]).

8.   Claims 4-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bitzer and Hill et al ("Hill", US 6023714)

Regarding claim 4, Bitzer teaches a method of supporting multiple languages for

a mobile communication terminal in a communication system including a mobile

communication network, a multiple language contents provider server (MLCPS)

connected to the mobile communication network and including multiple language

contents (Fig. 5 shows a network in which data language package can be downloaded

to the mobile communication terminal) ([0032]), and the mobile communication terminal

wirelessly connected to the mobile communication network ([0053]), the method

comprising the steps of: transmitting language package request data to the MLCPS

through the mobile communication network according to a language request of a user of

the mobile communication terminal (user's requesting the download of a language

package, receives language package information provided from the MLCPS (reception

of the language package) ([0054]); when language package information provided from

the MLCPS is downloaded, display menus and messages on a terminal display in the

language selected by the user (Fig. 3, Fig. 5). Bitzer does not teach including at least

one string set version and one font set version; dividing the downloaded language

package information into a string set and a font set; managing the string set and the font

set. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Hill. Hill teaches formatting

data in accordance with constraints of the display device (col. 2, lines 15-24). Hill further

teaches including string set (text), font set and managing the string set and font set (col.

2, lines 40-55) (line 46 of col. 6 to line 4 of col. 7). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Bitzer and Hill before him at the time the

invention was made, to include Hill's teaching in Bitzer's language package to ensure that the received language package is compatible with the mobile terminal.

Regarding claim 5, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches the language package comprises a header including string header information and font header information, a string including string offset information and real strings, and a font including font general information, glyph offset information, and glyphs (Hill, col. 9, lines 23-54)

Regarding claim 6, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches wherein the header comprises a string header including the string header information and a font header including the font header information (Hill, col. 9, lines 23-54).

Regarding claim 9, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches wherein the string comprises a string offset field in which the string offset information is recorded, and a string field in which the real strings are recorded (Hill, col. 6, lines 24-67, col 7, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 10, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches wherein the string offset field comprises a plurality of string offset fields, wherein positions where real strings exist are recorded on the respective string offset fields (Hill, col. 6, lines 24-67, col 7, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 11, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches wherein the string field comprises a plurality of string fields, wherein real strings used for the mobile communication terminal are recorded on the respective string fields (Hill, col. 6, lines 24-67, col 7, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 12, Bitzer as modified by Hill teaches wherein the font comprises a font general information field including the font general information, a glyph offset field including the glyph offset information, and a glyph field including the glyphs (col. 9, lines 24-54).

Allowable Subject Matter

9.   Claims 7-8, 13-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10.   Claims 16-17 are allowed.

11.   Applicant's arguments regarding the Bitzer reference have been responded in section 3 above.

12.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kieu D. Vu

Primary Examiner